

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/569,786	02/24/2006	Kathrin Redlin	2003P01224WOUS	6551
46726 7590 01/31/2008 BSH HOME APPLIANCES CORPORATION INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT			EXAMINER	
			SUTTON, ANDREW W	
100 BOSCH B NEW BERN, 1			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,	·		3765	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/31/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		$\mathcal{M}$				
•	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summany	10/569,786	REDLIN, KATHRIN				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Andrew W. Sutton	3765				
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statul Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailinearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUN .136(a). In no event, however, may d will apply and will expire SIX (6) Mo te, cause the application to become	IICATION. a reply be timely filed  DNTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 I	November 2007.					
<u></u>						
•	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims	•					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 9-19 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 9-19 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 24 February 2006 is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	re: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ e drawing(s) be held in abey ction is required if the drawir	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  ng(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat* * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received.  Its have been received in ority documents have been au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No en received in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		v Summary (PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		o(s)/Mail Date f Informal Patent Application				

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 9-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Damrath (DE 100 63 669). Damrath illustrates in an outer inflatable body 1 and an inner inflatable body 2 with the inner and outer inflatable bodies being in contact with one another, in particularly, at the front and sides of the torso sections and the chest sections, with the inner and outer inflatable bodies being air permeable.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Damrath (DE 100 63 669) in view of Paris (US 3,568,900). Damrath illustrates in an outer inflatable body 1 and an inner inflatable body 2 with the inner and outer inflatable bodies being in contact with one another, in particularly, at the front and sides of the torso sections and the chest sections, with the inner and outer inflatable bodies being air permeable. Damrath does not teach the contact areas having a portion with a greater air permeability to assist in drying of sleeves and pockets. Paris teaches the use of greater air permeability for the drying of pockets (Col. 1 lines 70-73). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Damrath with the air permeability of Paris to assist in the drying of garment portions that are thicker.

As to claims 13-19, With respect to the limitations of the ranges of permeability, the specification contains no disclosure of either the critical nature of the claimed permeability or any unexpected results arising therefrom, and that as such the ranges of permeability was arbitrary and therefore obvious. Such permeability limitation cannot be a basis for patentability, since where patentability is said to be based upon diameter or another permeability or another variable in the claim, the applicant must show that the ranges of permeability is critical. In re Woodruff, 919 F.2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ2d 1934 (Fed. Cir. 1990). One having ordinary skill in the art would be able to determine though routine experimentation the ideal dimension for a particular application.

As to claim 19, With respect to the limitation of a range of pressure ratio, the specification contains no disclosure of either the critical nature of the claimed pressure

Art Unit: 3765

ratio or any unexpected results arising therefrom, and that as such the range of pressure ratio was arbitrary and therefore obvious. Such pressure ratio limitation cannot be a basis for patentability, since where patentability is said to be based upon diameter or another pressure ratio or another variable in the claim, the applicant must show that the range of pressure ratio is critical. In re Woodruff, 919 F.2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ2d 1934 (Fed. Cir. 1990). One having ordinary skill in the art would be able to determine though routine experimentation the ideal dimension for a particular application.

#### Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 10/569,786

Art Unit: 3765

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew W. Sutton whose telephone number is (571) 272-6093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary L. Welch can be reached on (571) 272-4996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AWS 23 January 2008

GARY L. WELCH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

Page 5